

## II. CLAIM REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9, 12-14, 28-36, 39-41, 55-63 and 66-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,400,407 ("Zigmond") in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0210824 ("Shoff") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,493 ("Ottesen") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,556 ("Kataoka"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10, 37 and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,400,407 ("Zigmond") in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0210824 ("Shoff") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,493 ("Ottesen") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,556 ("Kataoka") in further view of U.S. Patent No 6,177,931 ("Alexander"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 11, 38 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,400,407 ("Zigmond") in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0210824 ("Shoff") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,493 ("Ottesen") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,556 ("Kataoka") in further view of U.S. Patent No 5,648,824 ("Dunn"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 presently recites, among other elements:

receiving a media stream at a receiver, the media stream comprising at least . . . video frame-specific tags including at least command and control information instructing said receiver to perform certain actions;

. . .

performing appropriate actions in response to the video frame-specific tags within the media stream, based at least on the command and control information instructing said receiver to perform the certain actions . . .

The Office Action alleges that *Kataoka* describes the above-quoted elements of Claim 1. The Office Action is mistaken. *Kataoka* describes a technique wherein categories specified by

tags in a broadcast stream are interpreted by a settop box and compared to user preferences. A match between a category and a user preference triggers a scene clipper module, which clips a scene of video. *Kataoka* at col. 8, lines 6–24. As the Examiner appeared to agree in the Interview, *Kataoka*'s category tags are not “command and control information” that “instruct[s] [a] receiver to perform certain actions” as recited in Claim 1. Rather, *Kataoka*'s category tags simply indicate a category for content within a broadcast stream. While *Kataoka*'s settop box may, depending upon user preferences, react to an indicated category by clipping a scene, the category tags do not themselves “instruct[] [the] receiver to perform certain actions.” Thus, *Kataoka* cannot teach or suggest “receiving . . . video frame-specific tags including at least command and control information instructing said receiver to perform certain actions” as recited in Claim 1.

Nor is any other reference alleged to teach or suggest the above-referenced elements. For at least the above reason, then, the method of Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Moreover, each of the remaining pending claims recite, or depend from claims that recite, similar features to those quoted above. Thus, each of the remaining pending claims is also allowable over the cited references for at least the above discussed reason. Removal of the rejections is therefore requested.

Moreover, the remaining pending claims include additional elements that the cited references also do not teach or suggest. However, to expedite prosecution, arguments concerning these additional elements are not provided at this time. Applicants reserve the right to further point out the differences between the cited art and these additional novel elements.